

Lee Middleton (Saturna Trustee)

I didn't want to be put in a place of editing the received draft as this assumes what the text requires are corrections and adjustments. What I overwhelmingly heard was: if the statement is going to be completely rewritten then go for it - rewrite from the ground top so you have full freedom to express the contemporary thoughts of staff, Trustees and Islanders. Trying to link the new revision to the previous document basically makes for very difficult reading and shows just how much of the text is new anyway.

Following that the redraft that can now be a rewrite should concretely embody the input of Islanders. A comprehensive consultation is underway. People want to have their say and the rewrite should flow from what is said.

Finally where there is an embracing of new material - such as reconciliation - work very hard to bring the reader along with you. Reconciliation requires conversation and education. The previous draft came dangerously close to presenting reconciliation as something too rarefied for the general public to understand with the subtext being "we'll take care of it". This is a big lost opportunity to help foster the conversations that will lead to reconciliation.

One final and related note on style and approach to mention in the previous text that based on feedback I believe will have to be abandoned is what the text counts as knowledge. Related to reconciliation the current draft talks about a diversity of ways of knowing and goes on to imply that the Trust will decide in each case concerning different ways of knowing which of those ways of knowing is counted as producing evidence to be used in making decisions. That may not have been the intent but in practice the previous text required decisions on evidence to in effect be made in secret. That doesn't

help anyone. In the rewrite a different way of addressing indigenous ways of knowing in comparison to scientific knowledge and community tradition will need to be found. I recognize that won't be easy but a full rewrite should making doing so easier than in the previous version.

The strongest arguments against IT overreach are its implications for taxpayers and its threat to the rural character of island life, which involves people and commerce as well as flora and fauna. On Saturna Island, we have a remarkable balance of protected nature and human habitation. For the latter to be sustained there have to be local businesses, local jobs, affordable housing, a school, accessible healthcare, etc. Those are the things we should be focusing on in debating the proposed rewrite of the IT policy statement.